

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of this application.

Claim 178 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,430,038 to Helot et al. (hereinafter "Helot"). Claims 179 – 188 and 197 – 200 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helot in view of U.S. Patent 4,682,749 to Strater (hereinafter "Strater").

No claims have been amended. Claims 1 – 177 and 189 – 196 have been canceled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. As such, claims 178 – 188 and 197 – 200 remain pending in this application.

Independent claim 178 provides:

A computer controlled display system, comprising:

a flat panel display having a display surface and an input for receiving display data to be displayed on said display surface;

a moveable assembly coupled mechanically to said flat panel display, said moveable assembly having a cross-sectional area which is substantially less than an area of said display surface, said moveable assembly being moveable to allow said flat panel display to be selectively positioned in space relative to a user of said computer controlled display system;

a base coupled mechanically to said moveable assembly and to said flat panel display through said moveable assembly, said base housing computer components comprising a microprocessor, a memory, a bus, an I/O (input/output) controller, and an I/O port, wherein said microprocessor is coupled to said input of said flat panel display; and

a counter-balancing spring assembly housed within said moveable assembly, said spring assembly having a proximal end

coupled with a biscuit of a display mounting assembly and a distal end coupled with a biscuit of a base rotation assembly.
(emphasis added)

Helot discloses a computer base 22 interconnected to display 28 by articulated mechanism 36. Articulated mechanism 36 includes a first arm member 42 and a second arm member 52. A pivot mechanism 27 interconnects first arm member 42 and rear edge 26 of computer base 22. A pivot mechanism 47 interconnects second arm member 52 and a bottom edge 34 of display 28. First arm member 42 and 52 are pivotally coupled at a pivot mechanism 57. (Helot, col. 2, lines 35 – 44, and FIGS. 1, 1A). Helot also discloses a stabilizer mechanism 81 that includes a locking knob 80 that is attached at pivot mechanism 57 where first arm member 42 and second arm member 52 interconnect. Locking knob 80 is adjustable to lock first arm member 42 and second arm member 52 together at a desired spatial position. Instead of locking knob 80, a sliding lock 86 (shown in phantom) may be used. Alternatively, stabilizer mechanism 81 may include one or more friction clutches for each of the pivot mechanisms 27, 47 or 57 shown in FIGS. 1 through 11. (Helot, col. 3, lines 65 – 67 to col. 4, lines 1 – 7, and FIG. 11). Nothing in Helot teaches a counter-balancing spring assembly housed within a moveable assembly.

In contrast, claim 178 includes the limitation, “a counter-balancing spring assembly housed within said moveable assembly.” The Office Action states that FIGS. 8 – 10 and the corresponding specification of Helot disclose a counter-balancing spring assembly within the moveable assembly. (Office Action, 06/11/03, page 3, lines 5 – 9). Applicants respectfully submit that FIGS. 8 – 10 and the

corresponding specification of Helot do not disclose a counter-balancing spring within the moveable assembly. FIGS. 8 – 9 of Helot show recessed portion 68 that is formed in back surface 32 of display 28 to receive articulated mechanism 36 in a nested relation. FIG. 10 shows second arm member 52 that may be slidably attached to a pair of opposite facing walls 70 in recessed portion 68. (Helot, col. 3, lines 50 – 63). There is no teaching of a counter-balancing spring.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 178 is not anticipated by Helot under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claim.

Claims 179 – 188 and 197 – 200 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helot in view of Strater. Claims 179 – 188 and 197 – 200 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 178 and thus they include the limitation “a counter-balancing spring assembly housed within said moveable assembly, said spring assembly having a proximal end coupled with a biscuit of a display mounting assembly and a distal end coupled with a biscuit of a base rotation assembly.” As discussed above, Helot does not teach this limitation.

Strater teaches an adjustable copyholder arm with cantilever arm segments and a copy support plate mounted at the free end of the cantilever arm. The cantilever arm 2 pivotally connected to the base 1 comprises two oblong cantilever arm segments 5 and 6, which are pivotally connected with each other, and the copy support plate 3 is mounted on the free end (i.e. the end furthest removed from the one connected to the base) of the cantilever arm 2 by means of a universal or cardan joint 7, whose two pivot axes are at right angles to each other. (Strater, col.

5, lines 3 – 10, and FIG. 1). Strater also teaches that pivot joints 8 and 9 are each provided with a securing mechanism which by way of traction lines 15 and 16 can be operated by a handle or handles 17 positioned on the copy support plate 3. The securing mechanism is constructed as an expanding brake device of the kind such that in both surfaces 10 of base 1 a circular groove 18 of a larger diameter than and coaxial to the pivot joint passage 12 is provided. (Strater, col. 5, lines 34 – 41, and FIG. 1). The spreading members 21 of each pivot joint 8 and 9 are pivotable under tension by means of coil springs 25 positioned inside of the cantilever arm segments 5 and/or 6. The traction lines can be relieved and the coil spring 25 causes an expansion of the expandable arc-segmental brake shoes 19 and therefore a frictional contact or engagement of gear teeth on the radially exterior sides of the circular grooves 18. (Strater, col. 6, lines 52 – 56, and FIG. 3). Nothing is Strater teaches or suggests a counter-balancing spring assembly housed within said moveable assembly, the spring assembly having a proximal end coupled with a biscuit of a display mounting assembly and a distal end coupled with a biscuit of a base rotation assembly. As such, Strater fails to cure the deficiency of Helot.

It is respectfully submitted that Helot and Strater do not teach or suggest a combination with each other. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on Applicant's own disclosure, to combine Helot and Strater.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation to combine Helot and Strater. The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer controlled display system of Helot to include the moveable assembly with a counter-

balancing spring assembly, including a compression link as taught by Strater, to allow for an increased range of motion of the display and to reduce the application force needed to adjust the display of Helot.” (Office Action, 06/11/03, page 4, lines 3 – 7). Here, the Office Action merely states an advantage of substituting the cantilever arm from Strater, with the articulated mechanism taught by Helot, without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination. The copyholder of Strater is intended to hold sheets of paper, cardboard, pictures and drawings. Nothing in Strater discloses or suggests supporting the weight of a significantly heavier object such as a computer display taught by Helot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 179 – 188 and 197 – 200 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. If the allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Suk Lee at (408) 720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Suk S. Lee
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,745

Dated: September 11, 2003

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300